

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Exploring linkages between climate change and sexual health: A scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	Logie, Carmen; Toccalino, Danielle; Reed, Anna Cooper; Malama, Kalonde; Newman, Peter; Weiser, Sheri; Harris, Orlando; Berry, Isha; Adedimeji, Adebola

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Ashley Hazel University of California San Francisco, Proctor Center
REVIEW RETURNED	24-Jul-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Dear Authors,</p> <p>I am excited about this review, as sexual health, broadly defined, is ignored in the human-planetary health and human disease ecology literature. The indirect effects of climate change on sexual and reproductive health may be great and should be understood, especially because the pathway between climate change and sexual-health outcomes are indirect and may require complex study design. Therefore, I am very enthusiastic about this planned scoping review. I, for one, will eagerly seek out your findings.</p> <p>Two points I would like to bring up for revision:</p> <p>1) Your database search is largely medical/public health and I am concerned you might be missing the anthropological literature, in which there is a small but growing body of ethnographic research into the impacts of climate change on reproduction and sexual health (see work on the Tsimane in Bolivia and the Himba in Namibia as examples). You might consider adding Web of Science and AnthroSource to your database search.</p> <p>2) I encountered many small typos (misplaced or missing punctuation, awkward wording, a few spelling mistakes) in your draft. A copy edit would help your final submission.</p> <p>Best of luck with the project. I look forward to your findings.</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Kelly Austin Lehigh University, Sociology and Anthropology
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Aug-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	The study protocol focuses on topics that are timely and relevant (climate change and impacts on reproductive health). As this is an emerging area of research, a review of this sort would be beneficial. They do a nice job explain how their systematic review would be
-------------------------	--

	different from what others have done. My main critiques are that the study protocol has some redundancies, and could be better organized. There are a number of grammar and spelling mistakes.
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer #1

Summary: I am excited about this review, as sexual health, broadly defined, is ignored in the human-planetary health and human disease ecology literature. The indirect effects of climate change on sexual and reproductive health may be great and should be understood, especially because the pathway between climate change and sexual-health outcomes are indirect and may require complex study design. Therefore, I am very enthusiastic about this planned scoping review. I, for one, will eagerly seek out your findings.

Comment 1: Your database search is largely medical/public health and I am concerned you might be missing the anthropological literature, in which there is a small but growing body of ethnographic research into the impacts of climate change on reproduction and sexual health (see work on the Tsimane in Bolivia and the Himba in Namibia as examples). You might consider adding Web of Science and AnthroSource to your database search.

Authors' Response: We appreciate the reviewers suggestion and have added Web of Science to our search strategy.

Comment 2: I encountered many small typos (misplaced or missing punctuation, awkward wording, a few spelling mistakes) in your draft. A copy edit would help your final submission

Authors' Response: We have proofread the document and corrected all typographical and grammatical errors identified. In addition, we have reworded certain phrases for better clarity.

Reviewer #2

Summary: The study protocol focuses on topics that are timely and relevant (climate change and impacts on reproductive health). As this is an emerging area of research, a review of this sort would be beneficial. They do a nice job explain how their systematic review would be different from what others have done.

Comment 1: My main critiques are that the study protocol has some redundancies, and could be better organized. There are a number of grammar and spelling mistakes.

Authors' Response: We have proofread the document and corrected all typographical and grammatical errors identified. In addition, we have reworded certain phrases for better clarity.